UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/553,823 | 08/05/2006 | Michael Charlton Powell | 0926-0001 | 3844 |
| 26568 COOK ALEX I | 7590 06/26/200 LTD | 9 | EXAMINER | |
| SUITE 2850 | AMC CTDEET | | ANDERSON, AMBER R | |
| 200 WEST ADAMS STREET CHICAGO, IL 60606 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3765 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/26/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | 10/553,823 | POWELL, MICHAEL CHARLTON | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | AMBER R. ANDERSON | 3765 | |

| | AMBER R. ANDERSON | 3/65 | |
|---|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>08 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A | LLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance | , or other evidence, whith 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f |). | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below. | sideration and/or search (see NOT | | cause |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | • | lucing or simplifying tl | ne issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | orresponding number of finally reje | cted claims. | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor | mpliant Amendment (l | PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | · | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | • | • | _ |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 6, 7 and 9. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | be entered and an ex | xplanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | l and/or appellant fail e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | s to provide a). |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> | of the status of the claims after er | itry is below or attach | ed. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| /GARY L. WELCH/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3765 | | | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments based on the claims as currently presented are not persuasive.

Applicant's First Argument: Powell does not teach or disclose a ful foamed block body (including a plurality of finger-receiving channels defined therein).

Examiner"s Response: The base of Powell is made of foam and therefore is a foamed block body. Further, Powell disclsoes finger channels defined therein wherein the finger channels are attached to the foam portion defining finger channels therein.

Applicant's Second Argument: Such Powell fingers do not satisfy the "snugly received" feature of applicant's claim 1. Examiner's Response: The examiner respectfully disagrees. The glove of powell is capable of deforming to snugly receive the fingers and further depending on the size of the wearer's hand/finers the glove would snugly receive a larger hand/finers/

Applicant's Third Argument: Thus, as being part of the foamed block body, the plurality of finger-receiving channels also are made of foam. Examiner's Response: It has not been expressly claimed that the finger-receiving channels are made of foam. The construction of the Powell reference satisfies the claim as currently presented comprising a foamed block body having finger-receiving channels defined therein wherein the finger-receiving channels attached to the foam portion define finger-receiving channels therein.